

LEVEL II

12
B.S.

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Madison, Wisconsin 53706

AD A088604

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 613

July 1980

OPTIMAL UPPER CONFIDENCE LIMITS FOR PRODUCTS
POISSON PARAMETERS WITH APPLICATIONS TO THE
INTERVAL ESTIMATION OF THE FAILURE
PROBABILITY OF PARALLEL SYSTEMS

by

Bernard Harris* and Andrew P. Soms**

* University of Wisconsin-Madison

** University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DDC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist.	Avail and/or special

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

DTIC
ELECTE
S
SEP 3 1980
D

FILE COPY

1. Introduction and Summary

A problem of fundamental interest to practitioners in reliability is the statistical estimation of the reliability of a system using experimental data collected on subsystems. In this paper, the subsystem data available consists of a sequence of Bernoulli trials in which a "one" is recorded if the subsystem functions and a zero is recorded if the subsystem fails. Thus for each of the k subsystems composing the system, the data provided consists of the pair (n_i, Y_i) , $i=1,2,\dots,k$, where Y_i is binomially distributed (n_i, p_i) . We assume that Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_k are mutually independent random variables.

The magnitude of interest in this problem is easily evidenced by the extensive literature devoted to it. In this regard, see the survey paper by Harris (1977) and Section 10.4 of the book by Mann, Schafer, and Singpurwalla (1974). In addition, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency has recently issued a Handbook for the Calculation of Lower Statistical Confidence Bounds on System Reliability (1980).

Historically, the first significant work on this problem was produced by Buehler (1957). However, Buehler's method as described in that paper is difficult to implement computationally when $k > 2$.

In this paper, we examine the problem of obtaining upper confidence limits for products of Poisson parameters. This problem is studied by means of majorization methods and Schur-convexity, such as described in the book by Marshall and Olkin (1979). A significant application is the determination of confi-

Optimal Upper Confidence Limits for Products of Poisson Parameters with Applications to the Interval Estimation of the Failure Probability of Parallel Systems

Bernard Harris* and Andrew P. Soms**

Abstract

The problem of obtaining optimal upper confidence limits for systems of independent parallel components is treated. Exact optimal upper confidence limits are obtained for an arbitrary number of components for specified failure combinations. For a small number of failures, bounds on the upper confidence limits are obtained. For an arbitrary number of failures an approximation is given which is justified numerically and asymptotically. The results of this paper are compared with the results given by Buehler (1957) and some numerical examples are presented.

Key words: Bounds; Optimal confidence limits; Parallel system; Reliability.

*University of Wisconsin-Madison

**University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

dence limits for the reliability of systems of k parallel subsystems, a fundamental problem in the statistical analysis of reliability.

2. Exact Solutions for Products of Poisson Parameters for Small Failure Combinations

Let $\tilde{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)$ be independent Poisson random variables with parameters $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k$, $k \geq 2$, and let $h(\tilde{\lambda}) = \prod_{i=1}^k \lambda_i$. Let

$$g(\tilde{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^k (x_i + d), \quad 1 < d < 1.5, \quad x_i = 0, 1, \dots \quad (2.1)$$

and denote the ordered points in the range of $g(\tilde{x})$ by

$$j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_m < \dots. \quad \text{Define} \quad \lambda_i = \left\{ \tilde{x} | g(\tilde{x}) = j_i \right\}. \quad (2.2)$$

Since x_i , $i=1, 2, \dots, k$, takes on non-negative integral values, we regard it as desirable to have d in (2.1) only assume non-integer values. This has the effect of making the partition defined in (2.2) finer than would be the case if d were an integer.

It is easily verified that

$$a_n = \sup \left\{ h(\tilde{\lambda}) \mid \prod_{i \in A_1, i \leq n} f(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{\lambda}) = \alpha \right\} \quad (2.3)$$

is a $(1-\alpha)$ upper confidence limit for $h(\tilde{\lambda})$, where

$$f(\tilde{x}; \tilde{\lambda}) = e^{-\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i} \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{\lambda_i^{x_i}}{x_i!}, \quad \lambda_i > 0, \quad x_i = 0, 1, \dots \quad (2.4)$$

The proof is identical with that given in Harris and Soms (1980).

Note that if \tilde{x} is fixed as $n_i \rightarrow \infty$, $i=1, 2, \dots, k$, then

$$a_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{q} \prod_{i=1}^k n_i \quad \text{where}$$

$$\bar{q} = \sup \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^k q_i \mid \prod_{i \in A_1, i \leq n} \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^k p_j^{x_{ij}} \right\} q_i^{x_{ij}} = \alpha \right\}.$$

Thus in practice $a_n / \prod_{i=1}^k n_i$ may be employed as an approximate $(1-\alpha)$ upper confidence limit for $\prod_{i=1}^k q_i$, $q_i = 1 - p_i$. In this sense the methods of this paper can be used as approximations for estimating the reliability of parallel systems when independent binomially distributed data is obtained for each component.

We proceed by showing that $g(\tilde{x})$ is a Schur-concave function and consequently

$$B_{\tilde{x}_0} = \left\{ \tilde{x} | g(\tilde{x}) \leq g(\tilde{x}_0) \right\}$$

is a Schur-convex set (see Marshall and Olkin (1974), pp. 1189-90 and Nevius, Proschan and Sethuraman (1977), p. 264). The Schur-concavity of $g(\tilde{x})$ follows immediately by noting that

$$(x_1 - x_2) \left(\frac{\partial g(\tilde{x})}{\partial x_1} - \frac{\partial g(\tilde{x})}{\partial x_2} \right) \leq 0.$$

Define $P(\tilde{x}_0; \tilde{\lambda})$ by

$$P(\tilde{x}_0; \tilde{\lambda}) = \int_{\tilde{x}_i \in B_{\tilde{x}_0}} f(\tilde{x}_i; \tilde{\lambda}) = P_{\tilde{\lambda}}^-(B_{\tilde{x}_0}) \quad (2.5)$$

and let

$$u(\tilde{x}_0; a) = \sup_{h(\tilde{\lambda})=a} P(\tilde{x}_0; \tilde{\lambda}), \quad 0 < a < 1. \quad (2.6)$$

Since the Poisson distribution has a monotone likelihood ratio,

$u(\tilde{x}_0; a)$ is a strictly decreasing function of a for fixed \tilde{x}_0 .

Hence for every c , $0 < c < 1$, there is a unique $a(c)$ such that

$$u(\tilde{x}_0; a(c)) = c. \quad (2.7)$$

Consequently, we also have that a_n (see (2.3)) is the solution in

a of

$$u(\tilde{x}_0; a) = \alpha. \quad (2.8)$$

(2.8) is established exactly as in Harris and Soms (1980).

The methodology to be employed is as follows. If $F(\tilde{x}; \tilde{\lambda})$ is a Schur-concave function of $R_i = -\ln \lambda_i$, $i=1, 2, \dots, k$, then it follows that $u(\tilde{x}_0; a) = F(\tilde{x}_0; a^{1/k} \tilde{\lambda})$, where $\tilde{\lambda} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$, and then the solution in a of $u(\tilde{x}_0; a) = \alpha$ is an optimal upper confidence limit for $\prod_{i=1}^k \lambda_i$. This will entail verifying (for fixed \tilde{x}_0) that

$$(R_1^{-R_2}) \left(\frac{\partial F(\tilde{x}_0; \tilde{\lambda})}{\partial R_1} - \frac{\partial F(\tilde{x}_0; \tilde{\lambda})}{\partial R_2} \right) < 0 \quad (2.9)$$

(see Marshall and Olkin (1974), p. 1190). Accordingly we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1: Let $g(\tilde{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^k (x_i + d)$, $1 < d < 1.5$, $k \geq 3$. Define $\tilde{0}_j$ as the j -vector all of whose components are zeros. Then let $x^{(1)} = \tilde{0}_k$, $x^{(2)} = (1, \tilde{0}_{k-1})$, $x^{(3)} = (2, \tilde{0}_{k-1})$, $x^{(4)} = (1, 1, \tilde{0}_{k-2})$, $x^{(5)} = (3, \tilde{0}_{k-1})$, $x^{(6)} = (4, \tilde{0}_{k-1})$, $x^{(7)} = (2, 1, \tilde{0}_{k-2})$ and $x^{(8)} = (5, \tilde{0}_{k-1})$. The set A_1 defined by (2.2) is the point $x^{(1)}$ and the different permutations of its components, $i=1, 2, \dots, 8$.

Further, for $j=1, 2, \dots, 7$, $F(x^{(j)}; \tilde{\lambda})$ is Schur-concave in R_1 , $i=1, 2, \dots, k$.

Proof: In the sense of the ordering given by (2.2), obviously $x^{(1)} < x^{(2)} < x^{(3)} < x^{(5)} < x^{(6)} < x^{(8)}$. Trivially, $d(2+d) < (1+d)^2$ and hence $(2+d)d^{k-1} = g(x^{(3)}) < (1+d)^2 d^{k-2} = g(x^{(4)})$. Similarly, since $1 < d < 1.5$, $(1+d)^2 < d(3+d)$ and hence $g(\tilde{x}^{(4)}) < g(\tilde{x}^{(5)})$. In the same way $g(x^{(6)}) < g(x^{(7)})$, $g(x^{(7)}) < g(x^{(8)})$, $g(x^{(8)}) < g(1, 1, \tilde{0}_{k-3})$ and $g(x^{(8)}) < g(2, 2, \tilde{0}_{k-2})$, establishing the first part of the conclusion.

In order to establish Schur-concavity, we must verify (2.9).

Thus consider

$$F(\tilde{x}^{(2)}; \tilde{\lambda}) = \sum_{j \in A_1} \prod_{i=1}^k e^{-\lambda_i} x_i^{(j)} / x_i^{(j)}, \quad (2.10)$$

where $\lambda_i = e^{-R_i}$. Define

$$G(\tilde{x}^{(2)}; \tilde{R}) = \left(\frac{\partial F(\tilde{x}^{(2)}; \tilde{\lambda})}{\partial R_1} - \frac{\partial F(\tilde{x}^{(2)}; \tilde{\lambda})}{\partial R_2} \right) / e^{-\sum_{i=1}^k R_i} \quad (2.11)$$

Letting $\tilde{R} = (R_1, \dots, R_k)$, we obtain

$$G(\tilde{x}^{(1)}; \tilde{R}) = (e^{-R_1} - e^{-R_2}),$$

$$G(\tilde{x}^{(2)}; \tilde{R}) = (e^{-R_1} - e^{-R_2}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^k e^{-R_i} \right),$$

$$G(\tilde{x}^{(3)}; \tilde{R}) = (e^{-R_1} - e^{-R_2}) \left(\sum_{i=3}^k e^{-R_i} + \sum_{i=1}^k e^{-\frac{R_i}{2}} \right),$$

$$G(\tilde{x}^{(4)}; \tilde{R}) = (e^{-R_1} - e^{-R_2}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{e^{-2R_i}}{2} + \sum_{i < j} e^{-\frac{R_i - R_j}{2}} \right),$$

$$G(\tilde{x}^{(5)}; \tilde{R}) = (e^{-R_1} - e^{-R_2}) \left(\sum_{i=3}^k \frac{e^{-2R_i}}{2} + \frac{e^{-R_1 - R_2}}{2} \right.$$

$$\left. + \sum_{i < j, (i,j) \neq (1,2)} e^{-\frac{R_i - R_j}{2}} + \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{e^{-3R_i}}{3!} \right),$$

$$G(\tilde{x}^{(6)}; \tilde{R}) = (e^{-R_1} - e^{-R_2}) \left(\sum_{i=3}^k \frac{e^{-2R_i}}{2} + \frac{e^{-R_1 - R_2}}{2} + \sum_{i < j, (i,j) \neq (1,2)} e^{-\frac{R_i - R_j}{2}} \right.$$

$$\left. + \sum_{i=3}^k \frac{e^{-3R_i}}{3!} - \frac{e^{-2R_1 - R_2} + e^{-R_1 - 2R_2}}{3!} + \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{e^{-4R_i}}{4!} \right),$$

and

3. Bounds on Confidence Limits

In this section we employ majorization techniques described in Proschan and Sethuraman (1977) and Nevius, Proschan and Sethuraman (1977) to obtain bounds for a_n . Throughout this section we assume only that the ordering function $g(\bar{x})$ is strictly increasing in each component and Schur-concave and thus the set B_{x_0} will be Schur-convex (see the discussion immediately preceding (2.5)).

In order to proceed, we need the preliminary results established below.

Theorem 3.1: Let c and a be given with $c > ka^{1/k}$ and consider the set $A(a, c)$ of vectors $\bar{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k)$, $\lambda_i \geq 0$, such that

$$\prod_{i=1}^k \lambda_i = a \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i = c. \quad (3.1)$$

Let $S_j = \max_{\bar{\lambda} \in A(a, c)} \sum_{i=1}^j \lambda_i$. Then there is a unique $\lambda^* \in A(a, c)$ of the form $\lambda_i = M_j$, $1 \leq i \leq j$, $\lambda_i = m_j$, $j+1 \leq i \leq k$, $M_j > m_j$, $S_j = jM_j$.

Proof: The condition $c > ka^{1/k}$ is a consequence of the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality and insures that $A(a, c)$ is non-trivial for $k \geq 3$. If $k=2$, there is only one solution of (3.1) with $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$, and hence the Theorem is trivially true. Consequently, suppose $k \geq 3$. Then for fixed j , (3.1) requires that any solution of the required type satisfy

$$jM_j + (k-j)m_j = c, \quad M_j^j m_j^{k-j} = a$$

and hence setting $m_j = (c - jM_j)/(k-j)$, we consider

$$G(\bar{x}(7); \bar{R}) = (e^{-R_1} - e^{-R_2}) \left(\frac{e^{-2R_1 - R_2}}{3} + \frac{e^{-R_1 - 2R_2}}{3} + \frac{e^{-R_1 - R_2}}{3} \right) + \sum_{i=3}^k \frac{e^{-3R_1}}{3!} + \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{e^{-4R_1}}{4!} + i! j, (1, 1) \tilde{F}(1, 2) \text{ or } (2, 1) \left(\frac{e^{-2R_1 - R_2}}{2} \right).$$

Now $R_1 > R_2$ implies $e^{-R_1} < e^{-R_2}$ and thus $(R_1 - R_2)$ and $(e^{-R_1} - e^{-R_2})$ have opposite signs. Hence it follows that $\tilde{F}(\bar{x}(1), \bar{\lambda})$, $i=1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7$ is Schur-concave in R_1 . The verification that $\tilde{F}(\bar{x}(6), \bar{\lambda})$ is Schur-concave may be accomplished by letting $k=2$, $e^{-R_2} = ce^{-R_1}$, $c > 0$, and examining the discriminant.

To show that (2.9) need not be positive for all \bar{x}_0 , consider $k=2$ and $\bar{x}_0 = (7, 0)$. Then

$$G(\bar{x}_0; \bar{R}) = (e^{-R_1} - e^{-R_2}) \left(\frac{e^{-6R_1} + e^{-6R_2}}{6!} - \frac{e^{-4R_1 - R_2} + e^{-3R_1 - 2R_2} + e^{-2R_1 - 3R_2} - R_1 - 4R_2}{5!} - \frac{e^{-3R_1 - R_2} + e^{-2R_1 - 2R_2} + e^{-R_1 - 3R_2} - 2R_1 - 2R_2}{4!} + \frac{e^{-2R_1 - R_2} - R_1 - 2R_2}{3} \right)$$

and this is negative for $e^{-R_1} = e^{-R_2} = 4$.

Buehler provided an extensive discussion of this problem for the ordering function determined by the product of the upper confidence limits for the individual components. In particular, he provided some numerical tabulations for $k=2$. Asymptotically Buehler's ordering function is given by

$$g_B(\bar{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^k (x_i + z_{\alpha} x_i^{1/2}),$$

where $\alpha' = 1 - (1 - \alpha)^{1/k}$, z_{α} satisfies $\Phi(z_{\alpha}) = 1 - \alpha$ and $\Phi(x)$ is the standard normal cumulative distribution function. It is easy to see that $g_B(\bar{x})$ is Schur-concave (see, e.g., Marshall and Olkin (1974), p. 1191).

$$f_j(M) = M^j \{(c-jM)/(k-j)\}^{k-j}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq k-1, \quad 0 \leq M \leq c/j. \quad (3.2)$$

Note that $f_j(0) = f_j(c/j) = 0$, and

$$f'_j(M) = (c-Mk) \left(\frac{jM^{j-1}}{k-j} \right) \left(\frac{c-jM}{k-j} \right)^{k-j-1}. \quad (3.3)$$

Thus, $f_j(M)$ is increasing for $0 \leq M < c/k$ and decreasing otherwise, further $f'_j(c/k) = (c/k)^{k-j} a$. Hence there is exactly one solution M_j of $f_j(M) = a$ with $M_j > c/k$, and therefore $M_j > M_j$.

Now assume that for some j , $1 \leq j \leq k-1$, the vector

$$\lambda^* = (\lambda_1^*, \lambda_2^*, \dots, \lambda_k^*) \text{ with } \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i^* = S_j \text{ is not of the form } (M_j, \dots, M_j, \underbrace{M_j, \dots, M_j}_{k-j}). \text{ Then let } \bar{\lambda}_{1j} = S_j/j \text{ and } \bar{\lambda}_{2j} = (c-S_j)/(k-j).$$

Define $\lambda_j^1 = (\lambda_{1j}^1, \lambda_{2j}^1, \dots, \lambda_{kj}^1)$ by $\lambda_{1j}^1 = \bar{\lambda}_{1j}$, $\lambda_{ij}^1 = \bar{\lambda}_{2j}$, $j+1 \leq i \leq k$. Since the geometric mean of a set of positive numbers whose sum is fixed is a maximum when they are all equal, we have

$\prod_{i=1}^k \lambda_{ij}^1 > a$. Now λ_j^1 is of the required form, however, from (3.2) and (3.3), $\prod_{i=1}^k \lambda_{ij}^1 > a$ implies that there is another solution of the required form with $\lambda_i > S_j/j$, $1 \leq i \leq j$, contradicting the maximality of S_j .

From (2.5) and (2.6), we can write

$$u(\tilde{x}_0, a) = \sup_{\substack{k \\ \prod_{i=1}^k \lambda_i = a}} \tilde{v}_\lambda(\tilde{x}_0) = \sup_c \sup_{\substack{k \\ \prod_{i=1}^k \lambda_i = c, \prod_{i=1}^k \lambda_i = a}} \tilde{P}_\lambda(\tilde{x}_0). \quad (3.4)$$

We state now the main result of this section, using Theorem 3.1.

Theorem 3.2: Let $v_i = M_i$, $v_i = iM_i - (i-1)M_{i-1}$, $2 \leq i \leq k-1$,

$v_k = c - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} v_i$, where M_1 is specified by Theorem 3.1. Then

$$u(\tilde{x}_0, a) \leq \sup_c \tilde{P}_{\tilde{v}}(\tilde{x}_0). \quad (3.5)$$

Proof: Since $\sum_{i=1}^j v_i = S_j$, $1 \leq j \leq k-1$, $\sum_{i=1}^k v_i = c$, \tilde{v} majorizes every λ with $\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i = c$, $\prod_{i=1}^k \lambda_i = a$ (Theorem 3.1). Then (3.5) follows, since if $\tilde{\lambda}_1$ majorizes $\tilde{\lambda}_2$, then for any Schur-convex set A , $P_{\tilde{\lambda}_1}(A) \geq P_{\tilde{\lambda}_2}(A)$ (Proschan and Sethuraman (1977) and Nevius, Proschan and Sethuraman (1971), p. 264 and pp. 267-9).

The vector \tilde{v} may be interpreted as the best vector that majorizes all vectors $\tilde{\lambda}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i = c$ and $\prod_{i=1}^k \lambda_i = a$. More specifically, there is no vector $\tilde{w} \neq \tilde{v}$ such that \tilde{w} majorizes \tilde{w} and \tilde{w} majorizes all $\tilde{\lambda}$ satisfying the two conditions given above.

The following is a suggested method for employing Theorem 3.2.

Find a_d such that

$$\alpha = F(\tilde{x}_0; a_d^{1/k} \tilde{i}).$$

Next calculate the smallest a , say a_m , such that $\sup_c \tilde{P}_{\tilde{v}}(\tilde{x}_0) \leq a$.

If $a_m = a_d$, this is the exact solution. Otherwise $a_d < a_m$ and $\sup_c \tilde{P}_{\tilde{v}}(\tilde{x}_0) < a$ (here $a = a_m$) and the solution a_n satisfies $a_d < a_n < a_m$. The vector \tilde{v} may be calculated by any of a variety of numerical techniques. In the numerical examples presented here, interval bisection was employed.

Example 1: Let $k = 5$, $a = 25$, $c = 15$. Then the 4 vectors $\tilde{\lambda}_1, \tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\lambda}_3$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_4$ of Theorem 3.1 are

$$\tilde{\lambda}_1 = (9.9660, 1.2585, 1.2585, 1.2585, 1.2585)$$

$$\tilde{\lambda}_2 = (6.2004, 6.2004, .8664, .8664, .8664)$$

$$\tilde{\lambda}_3 = (4.6696, 4.6696, 4.6696, .4955, .4955)$$

$$\text{and } \tilde{\lambda}_4 = (3.7172, 3.7172, 3.7172, 3.7172, .1309),$$

from which \tilde{v} is determined to be

$$\tilde{v} = (2.9660, 2.4349, 1.6079, .8601, .1309) .$$

Note that in the above example $v_1 \geq v_2 \geq \dots \geq v_k$. This in fact is always true, as the following theorem establishes.

Theorem 3.3: For \tilde{v} defined by Theorem 3.2, we have $v_1 \geq v_2 \geq \dots \geq v_k$.

Proof: It follows immediately that $v_1 \geq v_2$, since $M_1 \geq M_2$. Consider therefore v_j , $j \geq 2$. $v_j \geq v_{j+1}$, $j = 2, 3, \dots, k-1$ holds if and only if

$$jM_j - (j-1)M_{j-1} \geq (j+1)M_{j+1} - jM_j$$

or

$$jM_j \geq ((j+1)M_{j+1} + (j-1)M_{j-1})/2 ,$$

where $M_k = c/k$ (satisfying the condition $s_k = c = km_k$ of Theorem 3.1).

Let $\tilde{\lambda}_{A_j} = (1-\alpha_j)\tilde{\lambda}_{j-1} + \alpha_j\tilde{\lambda}_{j+1}$, $j = 2, 3, \dots, k-1$, where $\alpha_j = (1/2) + (1/(2j))$ and

$$\tilde{\lambda}_j = (\lambda_{j1}, \lambda_{j2}, \dots, \lambda_{jk})$$

and

$$\lambda_{ji} = M_j, \quad 1 \leq i \leq j, \quad \lambda_{ji} = m_j, \quad j+1 \leq i \leq k .$$

It follows that

$$\prod_{i=1}^k \lambda_{A_j, i} \geq a .$$

since $\sum_{i=1}^k \ln x_i$ is a concave function of x_1, \dots, x_k . Now let $\lambda_{B_j, i} = \left(\prod_{i=1}^j \lambda_{A_j, i} \right)^{1/j}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, j$, $\lambda_{B_j, i} = \left(\prod_{i=j+1}^k \lambda_{A_j, i} \right)^{1/(k-j)}$, $i = j+1, \dots, k$. Then

$$\prod_{i=1}^j \lambda_{B_j, i} \geq \prod_{i=1}^j \lambda_{A_j, i}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1 .$$

Thus, using the properties of M_i in Theorem 3.1,

$$jM_j \geq (j-1)\{(1-\alpha_j)M_{j-1} + \alpha_j M_{j+1}\} + (1-\alpha_j)M_{j-1} + \alpha_j M_{j+1} ,$$

yielding

$$jM_j \geq ((j+1)M_{j+1} + (j-1)M_{j-1})/2 + (1-\alpha_j)M_{j-1} ,$$

which establishes the theorem.

To illustrate the techniques of this paper, we compare numerical values obtained by the above method with those given in the examples from Mann, Schafer and Singpurwalla (1974, p. 505). From now on we assume $d = 1.1$.

Example 2: For $\tilde{x}_0 = (1, 2, 1)$ we obtain $a_d = a_n = 20.56$ for $\alpha = .10$. In Mann, Schafer and Singpurwalla, an AO non-randomized confidence bound of 20.7 is obtained.

Example 3: Let $\tilde{x}_0 = (2, 3, 5)$, $\alpha = .10$. Then we obtain $a_d = 135.46$. A summary of computer calculations which establishes $135.46 \leq a_n \leq 142.46$ is given below in Table 1. With the exception of the likelihood-ratio value of 133 and the AO non-randomized confidence bound of 129, all the other confidence bounds given in Mann, Schafer and Singpurwalla exceed the upper bound of 142.46. For $k=3$ it is possible to do a direct computer tabulation of $u(\tilde{x}_0; a)$. This gives $a_n = 135.46$, the diagonal value.

Insert Table 1 here.

The two examples below are for four and five component systems for which there are no comparable numerical examples available.

Example 4: Let $\tilde{x}_0 = (2, 2, 2, 2)$ and $\alpha = .10$. Then $a_d = a_n = 150.63$.

Example 5: Let $\tilde{x}_0 = (2, 2, 2, 2, 2)$ and $\alpha = .10$. Then $a_d = 429.69$. A summary of the computer calculations which establish $429.69 \leq a_n \leq 435.69$ is provided in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 here.

As $a_d^{1/k}$ increases, the difference between a_d and a_n becomes wider. Thus the techniques of Section 3 are more useful for small x_0 , or equivalently, small $a_d^{1/k}$. For example, for $\tilde{x}_0 = (5, 5, 5)$, $a_d = 387.18$, and it is not practical to compute a_n because it is much bigger than a_d . However, direct tabulation of $u(\tilde{x}_0; \alpha)$ reveals once more that $a_d = u(\tilde{x}_0; \alpha)$. A justification of why $a_d \approx u(\tilde{x}_0; \alpha)$ for large $a_d^{1/k}$ is given in the Appendix. This, together with the results of Section 2, suggests very strongly that for all practical purposes $a_d = a_n$.

Remarks: Note that Tables 1 and 2 are virtually linear in their behavior in the neighborhood of the solution. This suggests that solutions are obtainable by interpolation and then one should subject them to verification.

The calculations described above utilized two short FORTRAN programs for 2-10 components. Listings are obtainable from the authors.

4. Comparisons with Buehler's Tables

In order to provide an illustration of the performance of $g(\tilde{x}_0) = \prod_{i=1}^k (x_i + d)$, $1 < d < 1.5$, when compared with the tables given by Buehler (1957), we chose $d=1.1$, $k=2$. For $k=2$, the values of a_n and a_d coincided for both the ordering based on $g(\tilde{x})$ and Buehler's ordering and further were for all practical purposes

equal for the two different orderings.

In Table 3 we give Buehler's upper confidence limit, Buehler's diagonal value and the exact upper confidence limit and diagonal value corresponding to g , denoting them by a_{nB} , a_{dB} , a_{ng} and a_{dg} respectively. These values are provided for all failure combinations from $(0, 0)$ to $(5, 5)$ for $\alpha=.1$.

Insert Table 3 here

An examination of Table 3 shows that differences between the four alternatives presented are small for the specific example ($k=2$, $\alpha=.1$).

5. Concluding Remarks

In this paper a procedure for obtaining bounds on an optimal upper confidence limit for the failure probability of a parallel system is given. The procedure employs the theory of majorization and is valid for an arbitrary number of components and gives the exact answer or narrow bounds when the observed number of failures is small for each component. In addition, numerical and asymptotic justification is given for using a_d as an approximation to a_n . Tables of a_d are in preparation for moderate numbers of failures for 3, 4 and 5 components and will be available in the near future.

Appendix

Theorem A1: Let X_{1i} , $1 \leq i \leq k$, be independent identically distributed normal random variables with means λ and variances λ . Let X_{2i} , $1 \leq i \leq k$, be independent normally distributed random variables with means τ_i and variances τ_i , where $\tau_i = \lambda + O(\lambda^c)$,

$c < 1$, as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, and $\prod_{i=1}^k \tau_i = \lambda^k$. Let β be given, $0 < \beta < 1$,

let a be a specified positive real number, let $Z_1 = \prod_{j=1}^k (X_{1j} + a)$,

$Z_2 = \prod_{j=1}^k (X_{2j} + a)$ and let $d(\lambda)$ satisfy

$$P\{Z_1 \leq d(\lambda)\} = \beta. \quad (A.1)$$

Then as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\beta - P\{Z_2 \leq d(\lambda)\} = \begin{cases} O((\ln \lambda)^{1.5} \lambda^{-1}) & , \quad c \leq 0, \\ O(\lambda^{c-1}) & , \quad 0 < c < 1. \end{cases} \quad (A.2)$$

Proof: Throughout, let ϕ and Φ denote the density and distribution function of the standard normal. Clearly,

$$P\{Z_1 \leq d(\lambda)\} - P\{Z_2 \leq d(\lambda)\} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (f_1(\tilde{x}) - f_2(\tilde{x})) d\tilde{x}, \quad (A.3)$$

$$(\tilde{x}: \prod_{j=1}^k (x_j + a) \leq d(\lambda))$$

where $\tilde{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)$, f_1 is the probability density function of $X_{11}, X_{12}, \dots, X_{1k}$ and f_2 is that of $X_{21}, X_{22}, \dots, X_{2k}$. Now

$$P\{X_{1j} \geq -a, j = 1, 2, \dots, k\} \geq \left(1 - \frac{\lambda^{1/2}}{(\lambda+a)} \phi\left(\frac{\lambda+a}{\lambda^{1/2}}\right)\right)^k \quad (A.4)$$

and

$$P\{X_{2j} \geq -a, j = 1, 2, \dots, k\} \geq \prod_{j=1}^k \left(1 - \frac{\tau_j^{1/2}}{\tau_j+a} \phi\left(\frac{\lambda+a}{\tau_j^{1/2}}\right)\right). \quad (A.5)$$

Consequently, for λ sufficiently large, there exists a constant $m > 0$ such that

$$P\{X_{1j} \geq -a, j = 1, 2, \dots, k\} \geq 1 - e^{-m\lambda}, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (A.6)$$

Then, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$P\{Z_i \leq d(\lambda)\} = P\{Z_i \leq d(\lambda), X_{1j} \geq -a, j = 1, 2, \dots, k\} \\ + P\{Z_i \leq d(\lambda), \bigcup_{j=1}^k \{X_{1j} < -a\}\},$$

and therefore

$$P\{Z_1 \leq d(\lambda)\} - P\{Z_2 \leq d(\lambda), X_{1j} \geq -a, j = 1, 2, \dots, k\} \leq e^{-m\lambda}. \quad (A.7)$$

Next, we calculate

$$P\{Z_1 \leq d(\lambda), X_{1j} \geq -a, j = 1, 2, \dots, k\} - P\{Z_2 \leq d(\lambda), X_{2j} \geq -a, j = 1, 2, \dots, k\}.$$

Now

$$P\{Z_1 \leq d(\lambda), X_{1j} \geq -a, j = 1, 2, \dots, k | X_{1j} = x_j, j = 2, 3, \dots, k\} \\ = P\{X_{11} \leq \frac{d(\lambda)}{\prod_{j=2}^k (x_j + a)} - a\} \\ = \Phi\left(\frac{\frac{d(\lambda)}{\prod_{j=2}^k (x_j + a)} - a - \lambda}{\lambda^{1/2}}\right) = \Phi(b_{-})_{\lambda}. \quad (A.8)$$

Therefore

$$P\{Z_1 \leq d(\lambda), X_{1j} \geq -a, j = 1, 2, \dots, k\} \quad (A.9)$$

$$= \int_{-a}^{\infty} \int_{-a}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-a}^{\infty} \phi(b_{-1}) g_1(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k) dx_2 dx_3 \dots dx_k,$$

where $g_1(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k)$ is the probability density function of $X_{12}, X_{13}, \dots, X_{1k}$. From (A.6), we have that

$$\int_{-a}^{\infty} \int_{-a}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-a}^{\infty} \phi(b_{-1}) g_1(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k) dx_2 dx_3 \dots dx_k \quad (A.10)$$

$$= \int_{-a}^{\infty} \int_{-a}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-a}^{\infty} \phi(b_{-1}) g_1(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k) dx_2 dx_3 \dots dx_k \leq e^{-m\lambda}.$$

Hence we will estimate the first expression on the left hand side of

(A.10). Similarly, for Z_2 we will consider

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi\left[\frac{d(\lambda)}{\prod_{j=2}^k (x_j + \tau_j)} - a - \tau_1\right]^{1/2} g_2(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k) dx_2 dx_3 \dots dx_k, \quad (A.11)$$

where $g_2(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k)$ is the probability density function of $X_{22}, X_{23}, \dots, X_{2k}$. In the first integral in (A.10), let

$$(y_1 - \lambda)/\lambda^{1/2} = u_1 \quad \text{and in (A.11) let } (y_1 - \tau_1)/\tau_1^{1/2} = u_1,$$

$i = 2, 3, \dots, k$, obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi\left[\frac{d(\lambda)}{\prod_{j=2}^k (x_j + a)} - a - \lambda\right]^{1/2} g_1(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k) dx_2 dx_3 \dots dx_k \\ & \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi\left[\frac{d(\lambda)}{\prod_{j=2}^k (x_j + a)} - a - \tau_1\right]^{1/2} g_2(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k) dx_2 dx_3 \dots dx_k \\ & \int_{-M}^M \int_{-M}^M \dots \int_{-M}^M \left\{ \phi\left[\frac{d(\lambda)}{\prod_{j=2}^k (\lambda^{1/2} x_j + \lambda + a)} - a - \lambda\right]^{1/2} \right\} \left\{ \prod_{j=2}^k \phi(x_j) \right\} dx_2 dx_3 \dots dx_k \quad (A.13) \\ & - \phi\left[\frac{d(\lambda)}{\prod_{j=2}^k (\lambda^{1/2} x_j + \tau_j + a)} - a - \tau_1\right]^{1/2} \left\{ \prod_{j=2}^k \phi(x_j) \right\} dx_2 dx_3 \dots dx_k \end{aligned}$$

+ R_M ,

where $M = (2 \ln \lambda)^{1/2}$ and $R_M \leq 4 \frac{(k-1)e^{-M^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{1/2} M} = O(\lambda^{-1})$.

taking $d(\lambda) = \lambda^k - k_d(\lambda)\lambda^{k-1/2}$, $k_d(\lambda) = O(1)$,

$$\frac{d(\lambda)}{\prod_{j=2}^k (\lambda^{1/2} x_j + \lambda + a)} - a - \lambda \Big/ \lambda^{1/2} = (\lambda^{1/2} - k_d(\lambda)) \prod_{j=2}^k (1 + x_j \lambda^{-1/2} + a \lambda^{-1})^{-1} - \lambda^{1/2} - a \lambda^{-1/2}.$$

since $|x_i| \leq A$, we have

$$(1 + x_1 \lambda^{-1/2} + a \lambda^{-1})^{-1} = 1 - x_1 \lambda^{-1/2} + (-a + x_1^2) \lambda^{-1} + O((\ln \lambda)^{1.5} \lambda^{-1.5}).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (\lambda^{1/2} - k_d(\lambda)) \prod_{j=2}^k (1 + x_j \lambda^{-1/2} + a \lambda^{-1})^{-1} - \lambda^{1/2} - a \lambda^{-1/2} \\
 & = - \sum_{i=2}^k x_i - k_d(\lambda) - k_a \lambda^{-1/2} + k_d(\lambda) \left(\sum_{i=2}^k x_i \lambda^{-1/2} + \left(\sum_{i=2}^k x_i^2 \right) \lambda^{-1/2} \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \left(\sum_{2 \leq i < j} x_i x_j \right) \lambda^{-1/2} + O((\ln \lambda) \lambda^{1.5} \lambda^{-1}) \right). \quad (A.14)
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using $\tau_1 = \lambda^k / \prod_{j=2}^k \tau_j$, $\tau_j / \lambda = 1 + O(\lambda^{c-1})$,

$(\tau_j / \lambda)^{1/2} = 1 + O(\lambda^{c-1})$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$, $|x_1| \leq M$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(\frac{k}{\prod_{j=2}^k (\tau_j^{1/2} x_j + \tau_j + a)} - a - \tau_1 \right) / \tau_1^{1/2} \\
 & = (\tau_1 / \lambda_1)^{1/2} \left[(\lambda^{1/2} - k_d(\lambda)) \prod_{j=2}^k (1 + x_j \tau_j^{-1/2} + a \tau_j^{-1})^{-1} \lambda^{1/2} \right] - a \tau_1^{-1/2} \\
 & = - \sum_{i=2}^k x_i - k_d(\lambda) - k_a \lambda^{-1/2} + k_d(\lambda) \left(\sum_{i=2}^k x_i \lambda^{-1/2} + \left(\sum_{i=2}^k x_i^2 \right) \lambda^{-1/2} \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \left(\sum_{2 \leq i < j} x_i x_j \right) \lambda^{-1/2} + O((\ln \lambda) \lambda^{1.5} \lambda^{-1}) \right). \quad (A.15)
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining (A.14) and (A.15) with (A.7), (A.9), (A.10) and (A.11) establishes the theorem.

For $c < \frac{1}{2}$ standard weak convergence arguments show that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} (\beta - P\{Z_2 \leq d(\lambda)\}) = 0.$$

In this case Theorem A1 provides additional information by specifying the rate of convergence.

By standardizing the first expression in (A.13) and applying the dominated convergence theorem the following result can be obtained.

Theorem A2: Let X_{1i} , $1 \leq i \leq k$, be independent identically distributed normal random variables with means λ and variances λ . Let X_{2i} , $1 \leq i \leq k$, be independent normally distributed random variables with means τ_1 and variances τ_1 , where $\tau_1 = \lambda + O(\lambda^c)$, $c < 1$ and let β , Z_1, Z_2 and $d(\lambda)$ be specified as in Theorem A1.

Then

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} (\beta - P\{Z_2 \leq d(\lambda)\}) = 0.$$

References

- Buehler, Robert J. (1957), "Confidence Limits for the Product of Two Binomial Parameters," Journal of the American Statistical Association, 52, 482-93.
- Harris, Bernard (1977), "A Survey of Statistical Methods in Systems Reliability Using Bernoulli Sampling of Components," in Theory and Applications of Reliability: With Emphasis on Bayesian and Nonparametric Methods, eds. Chris P. Tsokos and I.N. Shimi, New York: Academic Press.
- Harris, Bernard and Soms, Andrew P. (1980), "Bounds for Optimal Confidence Limits for Series Systems," University of Wisconsin-Madison Department of Statistics technical report.
- Mann, Nancy R., Schafer, Ray E., and Singpurwalla, Nozer D. (1974), Methods for Statistical Analysis of Reliability and Life Data, New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Marshall, Albert W. and Olkin, Ingram (1974), "Majorization in Multivariate Distributions," The Annals of Statistics, 2, 1189-1200.
- _____, and Olkin, Ingram (1979), Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and Its Applications, New York: Academic Press.
- Proschan, Frank and Sethuraman, Jayaram (1977), "Schur Functions in Statistics, I. The Preservation Theorem," The Annals of Statistics, 5, 256-262.
- Nevius, Edward S., Proschan, Frank, and Sethuraman, Jayaram (1977), "Schur Functions in Statistics, II. Stochastic Majorization," The Annals of Statistics, 5, 263-273.

1. Summary of Calculations Used to Obtain the Upper Bound for a_n in Example 3

λ	\bar{v}	$\sup_{\frac{c}{c}} P_{\bar{v}}(B_{\frac{c}{c}})$
135.46	4.7283	.1101
136.46	4.7409	.1086
137.46	4.7532	.1071
138.46	4.7656	.1057
139.46	4.7780	.1042
140.46	4.7902	.1028
141.46	4.8024	.1014
142.46	4.8057	.9999

2. Summary of Calculations Used to

Obtain the Upper Bound for a_n in Example 5

a	$\sup_{\mathcal{C}} P_{\mathcal{V}}^-(B_{\mathcal{V}}^-)$ x_0
429.69	.1016
430.69	.1013
431.69	.1010
432.69	.1007
433.69	.1004
434.69	.1001
435.69	.0998

3. Comparison of Exact and Diagonal Buehler's Values,

a_{nB} and a_{dB} , Respectively, with the Exact and Diagonal Values

a_{nB} and a_{dB} , Respectively, Corresponding to $g(\bar{x})$

x_1	x_2	a_{nB}	a_{dB}	a_{nB}	a_{dB}
5	5	60.7	60.70	60.70	60.70
5	4	51.8	51.89	51.89	51.89
5	3	41.2	41.21	41.22	41.21
5	2	31.9	31.91	31.91	31.90
5	1	23.3	23.34	23.34	23.34
5	0	12.3	12.32	12.32	12.32
4	4	44.3	44.40	44.40	44.40
4	3	35.7	35.73	35.74	35.73
4	2	27.2	27.23	27.23	27.23
4	1	18.8	18.77	18.77	18.76
4	0	9.05	9.05	9.05	9.05
3	3	28.9	28.89	28.89	28.89
3	2	22.0	22.04	22.04	22.03
3	1	15.1	15.08	15.08	15.08
3	0	8.24	8.24	8.24	8.24
2	2	16.8	16.80	16.80	16.79
2	1	11.8	11.85	11.85	11.85
2	0	5.59	5.59	5.59	5.59
1	1	7.09	7.08	7.08	7.08
1	0	3.86	3.78	3.78	3.78
0	0	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

(9) Tentative Report

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER TR No. 613	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A088 604	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Optimal Upper Confidence Limits for Products of Poisson Parameters with Applications to the Interval Estimation of the Failure Probability of Parallel Systems.		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Scientific-Interim
7. AUTHOR(s) Bernard Harris and Andrew P. Soms		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER 15
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Department of Statistics & Mathematics Res. Ctr. University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin 53706		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) ONR N00014-79-C-0321 Army DAAG29-80-C-0041
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Office of Naval Research 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 12 14
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) 14 UNIB-LR-80-613		12. REPORT DATE July 31, 1980
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 24 pages
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Distribution of this document is unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Bounds Optimal confidence limits Parallel system Reliability		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The problem of obtaining optimal upper confidence limits for systems of independent parallel components is treated. Exact optimal upper confidence limits are obtained for an arbitrary number of components for specified failure combinations. For a small number of failures, bounds on the upper confidence limits are obtained. For an arbitrary number of failures an approximation is given which is justified numerically and asymptotically. The results of this paper are compared with the results given by Buehler (1957) and some numerical examples are presented.		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE
S/N 0102-LF-014-6601

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)